

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

In the application as examined, claims 61-67 are pending. Claims 1-60 have been previously cancelled. In the present response, claims 61, 65 and 67 have been amended. Claims 63-64 and 66 are unchanged. Claim 62 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 61-64 and 66-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochenour (U.S. 4,090,668) in view of Ouellette et al (U.S. 6,281,649).

The allowability of claim 65 is noted with appreciation. Claim 65 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and is therefore allowable.

Kochenour describes a windshield washing and deicing system comprising a reservoir for containing washer fluid having a sealed container supported therein including a pump to transfer fluid from the reservoir to the

container and from the container to a plurality of nozzles located adjacent a vehicle window. The system of Kochenour includes a conventional motor vehicle, including conventional windshield wipers connected to the drive linkage of a motor for providing reciprocating motion of the wipers across the windshield. (Column 3, lines 15-29)

Oullette describes a dual motor windshield wiper system and windshield washer system integrated together into a single assembly including two motors, a control circuit, a fluid reservoir, a pump, and at least one mounting member that supports the motors. The positions of the wipers can be controlled to follow targeted positions that are determined in accordance with acceleration, velocity, and deceleration values that are calculated using a wiper speed setting selected by the vehicle driver.

Applicants have amended claim 61 to include the recitation of claim 62. Claim 61 now includes, *inter alia*, the recitation "said controller being operative to change the direction of said at least one windshield wiper without reaching at least one of said two limits of travel." Similar amendments have been made to claim 67.

In rejecting claim 62, the Examiner wrote (page 3, second paragraph):

The apparatus of Kochenour also teaches ... the controller is operative to change the direction of at least one windshield

wiper without reaching at least one of the two limits of travel..."

Applicants respectfully submit that Kochenour does not show or suggest apparatus for cleaning or de-icing a vehicle window including, inter alia, a windshield wiper actuator controller operative to change the direction of at least one windshield wiper without reaching at least one of said two limits of travel, as recited in amended claim 61. Oullette also does not show or suggest apparatus for cleaning or de-icing a vehicle window including, inter alia, a windshield wiper actuator controller operative to change the direction of at least one windshield wiper without reaching at least one of said two limits of travel, as recited in amended claim 61.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art, either alone or in combination, shows or suggests apparatus for cleaning or de-icing a vehicle window, as recited in amended claim 61, including, inter alia, a windshield wiper actuator controller operative to change the direction of at least one windshield wiper without reaching at least one of said two limits of travel, and that amended claim 61 is therefore patentable.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art, either alone or in combination, shows or suggests a method for cleaning or de-icing a vehicle window, including, inter alia, changing the direction of said at least one windshield wiper without reaching at least one of said two limits of travel, as recited in amended claim 67 and that amended claim 67 is therefore patentable.

Claims 63-64 and 66 depend from claim 61 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Tiberiu Weisz
Reg. No. 29,876
GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
270 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor
(212) 684-3900

Date: September 4, 2008

S:\Henry\luu\CLIENTS\3769-019 CON.MICRO-HEAT\3769-019 CON amendment3